

### **REMARKS**

The forgoing Amendment and remarks which follow are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed July 23, 2003 in relation to the above-identified patent application. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-6, 9-11 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by the Huang et al reference. Additionally, the Examiner rejected Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the combination of the Huang et al and Song references.

By this Amendment, Applicant has made a non-narrowing, clarifying amendment to each of independent Claims 1 and 19 to describe the first semiconductor die as being "directly" attached to each of the leads. Applicant respectfully submits that each of independent Claims 1 and 19 is not anticipated under Section 102(a) by the Huang et al reference due to the recitation in each such claim of the first semiconductor die being "directly" attached to each of the leads.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Huang et al reference clearly does not teach, suggest or show any embodiment of a semiconductor package wherein a semiconductor die is directly attached to the leads. In the embodiment of the semiconductor package shown in Figure 7 of the Huang et al reference (relied upon by the Examiner), a first or lower chip 304 is shown as being mounted to the top surface of the die pad 318 via a layer of adhesive 322. Disposed about the periphery of the die pad 318 are a plurality of leads 326, each of which includes a first or top surface 328a, and a second or bottom surface 328b which has a stepped structure defining a protruded zone 330. Stacked upon the lower first chip 304 is an upper second chip 310 which is secured to the first chip 304 by a layer of adhesive 324. As clearly shown in Figure 7, no portion of the lower surface of the chip 304 is attached to top, first surfaces 328a of the leads 326. Rather, the leads 326 are disposed well outward of the peripheral edges of the first and second chips 304, 310. The direct attachment of the semiconductor die to the leads in accordance with the present invention is clearly recited in each of amended independent Claims 1 and 19, in addition to being clearly shown in Figures 1

and 1A of the present application and in the assembly steps shown in Figures 2A-E thereof. The deficiencies of Figure 7 of the Huang et al reference hold true for the single chip embodiments shown in Figures 3, 5 and 6 thereof. The shortcomings of the Huang et al reference are not alleviated by the Song reference, the pertinent teachings of which are limited to the purported exposure of a die pad within a package body.

Indeed, the Examiner appears to have acknowledged the distinctions between the present invention and the cited Huang et al reference in the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action. More particularly, in responding to the argument presented by Applicant in the prior May 8, 2003 Amendment regarding the absence of any teaching or suggesting in the Huang et al reference with respect to a semiconductor die being directly attached to the leads, the Examiner indicated that the recitation of "directly attached" was not present in the claims. As a result of this comment and as indicated above, Applicant has now amended each of independent Claims 1 and 19 to describe the semiconductor die as being "directly attached" to the leads. This amendment to each of Claims 1 and 19 is not a narrowing amendment for purposes of traversing the prior art, but rather is solely for clarity purposes based on the Examiner's suggestion. For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Huang et al reference clearly fails to teach, suggest or show any embodiment of a semiconductor package wherein a semiconductor die is directly attached to the leads of the package. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 19 as amended are not anticipated by the Huang et al reference and are in condition for allowance, as are Claims 2-11 and 20-25 as being dependent upon respective allowable base claims.

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the stated grounds of rejection have been overcome, and that Claims 1-11 and 19-25 are now in condition for allowance. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the present Amendment does not raise new issues which would require further searching on the part of the Examiner, and therefore respectfully requests that the same be considered and entered by the Examiner. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/043,946  
Attorney Docket No. AMKOR-017A

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 19-4330.

Date:

9/3/03

Customer No. 007663

Respectfully submitted,



By:

Mark B. Garred

Reg. No. 34,823

STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER

75 Enterprise, Suite 250

Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

(949) 855-1246